

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 06/23/2003 10/601,381 Arthur Bobovitch 0-03-139 7629 **EXAMINER** 7590 08/24/2005 Kevin D. McCarthy TARAZANO, DONALD LAWRENCE Roach Brown McCarthy & Gruber, P.C. ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1620 Liberty Building 420 Main Street 1773 Buffalo, NY 14202

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applicatio	n No	Applicant(s)		
•					PC	
:	Office Action Summary	10/601,38	l 	BOBOVITCH ET AL.		
•	Office Action Gammary	Examiner		Art Unit		
	The MAIL INC DATE of this comm		e Tarazano	1773		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this comm r Reply	inication appears on the	COVER SHEET WITH THE C	orrespondence address -	-	
THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMU sions of time may be available under the provisic SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this coperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty period for reply is specified above, the maximum te to reply within the set or extended period for reeply received by the Office later than three monthed patent term adjustment: See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	NICATION. Ins of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no every Ins of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no every Instance of the status of the	nt, however, may a reply be tim tory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communica D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.	
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) t	iled on <u>09 June 2005</u> .				
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims		· .			
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠						
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□ .	The specification is objected to by	the Examiner.	•			
10)[10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any ob-					
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) include	=				
11)∐	The oath or declaration is objected	I to by the Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152	2.	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a clai All b) Some * c) None of Certified copies of the prior Certified copies of the prior Copies of the certified copie application from the Interna	ty documents have been ty documents have been es of the priority docume tional Bureau (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been receive e 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
Attech	tle\					
1) Notic	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)		
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 r No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail D			

DETAILED ACTION .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on

Page 2

sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kondo et al

(5,614,315).

2.

3. Kondo et al. teach crosslinked films comprising a polypropylene core and polyethylene

surface layers and these films would have the claimed "incompatibility"

4. The examiner points to Van Loon et al. (6,094,889) column 1, lines 10-35; and Wagner,

Jr. et al. (4,495,027) column 3, lines 13+ to show that polypropylene does not have good

compatibility with ethylenic polymers.

Response to Arguments

5. The applicants have overcome the outstanding double patenting rejection. Claims 2-3 are

objected to as depending from a rejected claim. Claims 4-8 are allowed. In view of newly

discovered art, claim 1 is rejected.

Application/Control Number: 10/601,381 Page 3

Art Unit: 1773

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Lawrence Tarazano whose telephone number is (571)-272-1515. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6:00 (off every other Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571)-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

D. Lawrence Tarazano Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

